

***National Spent Nuclear Fuel Program
Strategy Meeting
October 29-30, 2002
Las Vegas, NV***

AGENDA

Tuesday, October 29

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>* Presenter</i>
8:00	Introductions	Mark Arenaz
8:05	Welcome	
8:10	National Spent Nuclear Fuel Program Direction	Mark Arenaz
8:30	Action Items - October 2001 Strategy Meeting	√ Phil Wheatley
8:40	Repository Program Update	√ Paul Harrington
9:15	Repository Licensing Strategy for DOE SNF	√ Bill Hurt
10:00	Break	
10:20	NRC Technical Exchange Meeting on DOE SNF	Joe Price
10:40	WASRD (the future), other data needs	Markus Popa
10:50	EM-RW MOA Transition Team Development	Larry Vaughn
11:15	EM SNF Corporate Project Team Status	√ Christine Gelles
Noon	Lunch	
1:30	EM HLW Project Team Status & SNF Interfaces	Pete Dirkmaat
	Site SNF Strategies	
	Focus discussion on plans to accelerated cleanup and identify needs to implement.	
1:40	Hanford	√ Mark French
1:50	SRS	√ Randy Ponik
2:15	INEEL	Pete Dirkmaat
2:30	ANL-W – MEDC/EMT	√ Bob Pahl
3:15	Break	
3:30	Introduction of new DOE-RW QA Director	Denny Brown
3:45	Quality Assurance Update	√ Robert Blyth
4:00	Canister and Weld Development Update	√ Tom Hill
4:20	Safeguards & Security Update	Bill Hurt
4:30	Adjourn	

* Overheads or Electronic Presentation Used

Wednesday, October 30

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>* Presenter</i>
8:00	Opening Remarks	Mark Arenaz
8:15	DOE - Contractor Strategy Session <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Site Strategies- SRS Melt/Dilute termination impacts- Use of INEEL packaging facility- Issue the NSNFP can address to assist the sites in meeting their accelerated clean-up schedules.	
9:30	Break	
9:45	Summary Report on Breakout Sessions	Andy Griffith/ Phil Wheatley
10:25	Source Term Development	√ Henry Loo
11:00	Transportation Planning Update	Tom Hill
11:05	EM SNF Input to RW Status and Integrated Receipt Schedule Update	Mark Arenaz
11:10	Action Items	Mark Arenaz
11:20	Adjourn	

* *Overheads or Electronic Presentation Used*

PATH FORWARD

The next meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 11-12, 2003, in Washington D.C.

ATTENDEES

Arenaz, Mark Armour, Don A. Beck, Jim Blaney, Dick Blyth, Bob Braase, Lori Brown, Denny Chambers, Billy Chapman, Mark Cohen, Eric Cox, David DeMonia, Brian Dirkmaat, Pete Eckert, Howard Ferrell, Larry Fillmore, Denny Franklin, David	French, Mark Fujita, Ed Gelles, Christine Gomberg, Steve Griffith, Andy Gupta, Dinesh Harrington, Paul Hill, Tom Hurt, Bill Jain, Vijay Koutsandreas, Denis Linhart, Jim Loo, Henry H. Luptak, Al Meredith, Dave McCormack, Roger Morissette, Richard	Morton, Sheryl O'Dell, Maureen Opelski, Ed Pahl, Bob Ponik, Randy Popa, Markus Price, Joe Schramm, Bruce Schuermann, Steve Scorah, John Simonds, Jack Swift, Bill Vaughan, Larry Weatherby, Greg Weber, Carl Wheatley, Phil
--	---	--

ACTION ITEMS

#	Action Item	Designee	Status
1	E-mail presentations to Lori Braase (bse@inel.gov) for inclusion on the NSNFP web page.	Presenters	
2	Work with Karen Guevara and Larry Vaughn to ensure integration with the change in direction to the Comprehensive MOA.	Christine Gelles	Due: 11/7/02
3	Clarify the NSNFP role in QA Certification for the sites in FY-03.	Mark Arenaz	Due: 11/21/02
4	Provide Pete Dirkmaat a list of the 2.3% High Impact Fuels.	Henry Loo	Due: 11/7/02 Complete: 11/4/02

NATIONAL SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL PROGRAM STRATEGY MEETING SUMMARY October 29-30, 2002

The information below represents discussion highlights or questions raised during the presentations. Copies of the presentations will be available electronically on the NSNFP Web page after November 28, 2002, at <http://nsnfp.inel.gov/program>.

Welcome / National Spent Nuclear Fuel Program (NSNFP) Direction

Mark Arenaz

Mark Arenaz opened the NSNFP Strategy Meeting and discussed the status of the program within the Department Of Energy (DOE) Environmental Management (EM) oversight. DOE-EM has been redefining their mission to focus on the clean-up activities at the EM sites. EM is considering the transfer of the NSNFP to the Office of Radioactive Waste Management (OCRWM) as a better fit for the long-term mission of spent nuclear fuel (SNF) disposal. Negotiations have started to determine how to split the work with EM and what the new purpose would be for the program. Nothing has been finalized at this time.

October 2002 Strategy Meeting Action Items Review

Phil Wheatley

Phil Wheatley reviewed the status of the action items from the last NSNFP Strategy Meeting held in Washington D.C. in April 2002.

Regarding the third action item, please submit your Generic Fuel Object (GFO) concerns or comments to Andy Griffith as soon as possible. The next step in this sequence is to set up project teams from the breakout sessions in Washington D.C. This group will look at how we treat the GFOs. Are they considered SNF or Remote Handled Transuranic Waste (RH-TRU)?

Discussion:

- Savannah River Site (SRS) just deactivated and inventoried their K-basin with no GFO problems. One unknown item was found, but was identified through prints and the disposition map.
- GFOs are fuel objects that are detected from gamma scans. Their origins are often unknown because they are out of place or are pieces of fuel fallen from storage baskets over the years. Each is unique and may have a different disposition path.

Repository Program Update

Paul Harrington

Paul Harrington provided an update on OCRWM realignment and Repository project activities.

- Two divisions of OCRWM responsibility have been identified:
 - Office of Repository Development (West coast) is focused on repository development and license strategy.
 - Office of Strategy and Program Development (East coast) is focused on policy development.
- Schedule. Approval for the new Comprehensive Conceptual Design (CD-1) is expected in late January 2003. Development of design solutions will continue.
- Potential Surface Facility Design (first facility)
 - The Dry Handling Hot Cell does not have the ability to handle degraded SNF.
 - It is being designed for commercial SNF or SNF in canisters.
 - It does have broad handling capability for fuel types.
 - There is some lag storage capability outside of the facility (1000 MTHM).
- The second facility will also be dry and bigger than the first facility.

Q. Are more inspections needed at the sites to ensure we don't contaminate the dry hot cell?

A. No. We don't want this to be a significant inspection issue. Problem SNF could be set to the storage pad or kept in a cask.

- There is a limited amount of storage for 24" and HLW canisters (~200' X 200').
- The dry cell has one set of ports – simple design – to meet the 2010 goal.
- The throughput rate is 500 MTHM per year, which is about one Waste Package every two days. This is driven by how much is in each cask.
- Omnidirectional Lift Transporter (OLT) is the answer to the crane lift issue. It provides transport between buildings and from surface facility to underground emplacement drifts.
 - There was a concern with the previous rail system's ability to make tight turns.
 - There are no runaway issues with the OLT like a rail system.
 - It is easier to retract failed waste packages.
 - Battery powered underground.
 - There is an 18" hydraulic lift on the OLT.
 - The thickness on the pallets can be adjusted.

- Potential Subsurface Facility Design
 - Reduced the amount of tunneling.
 - Panel 1 does not require a lot of tunneling.
 - Panel 5 will not be needed if the High Temperature Facility option is chosen and 70 MTHM is the limit.

Q: Are there any remaining drop scenario concerns?

A: Cranes were originally designed to move the subassemblies and to handle the canisters. In the current design, cranes will be used to remove the canister from the transportation cask and move at floor level to the Load-In area.

Q: What is the Repository Thermal Loading?

A: The base case is 1/10 meter spacing. High thermal loading is in the TSPA.

Q: Can construction start before receiving authorization?

A: No, but we are trying to identify activities that can be done.

- Set 1: Security; Health and Safety; and Water, Power, and Emergency Systems.
- Set 2: Improving roads and fences.
- Set 3: More aggressive activities.

Repository Licensing Strategy for DOE SNF

Bill Hurt

Bill Hurt discussed the outcomes of the Pre-Closure Workshops held during the last several months.

Q: Explain why the License Application will not present DOE SNF beyond Category 2 events.

A: We only have to represent likely or unlikely events as part of the docketed information. The NRC can request further information on the analysis of "Beyond Category 2 Events."

- Category 1 = 10^{-2} and Category 2 = 10^{-4} expected during a 100-year period (frequency based).

Q: Are bounding values going to be sufficient?

A: We think so based on the safety case for preclosure.

- DOE is more vulnerable with postclosure criticality due to DOE SNF not being in tact (opposite from commercial). However, with the addition of poisons the probability and consequence is low.

Q: Do we need to pursue the development of depleted uranium?

A: It is up to the project. We cannot sell “no criticality” to the public based on probability. We need to screen out criticality on probability and take additional measures even though it is beyond Category 2.

Q: What is the probability of a volcanic event?

A: 2×10^{-8} using the mean values, not the tails of the distribution.

Q: Will this information be presented to the NRC?

A: Yes.

Q: What is the status of the High Integrity Canister (HIC)?

A: The HIC will not be relied on for the safety case.

- It makes good sense to standardize the HIC.
- There is some consideration for putting HLW in a standard canister, but they may also need to use a HIC.
- One HIC has been fabricated.

Q: Will the standard canister be used for Fort Saint Vrain (FSV) or for Three Mile Island (TMI) fuel?

A: FSV has a transportation cask.

Q: How will the TMI in the NUHOMS Dual Purpose Container (DPC) be removed from the cask and transferred to a WP at the Repository?

A: TMI has no lifting fixture and is stored in a horizontal position. The current Repository design has no way to pick up the DPC. There will have to be an interim step to get from horizontal to vertical.

NRC Technical Exchange Meeting on DOE SNF

Joe Price

Joe Price updated the participants on the discussions with the NRC. Joe Ziegler is aware of and supports these discussions. The next presentations will be made to the Office of Systems Analysis and Systems Development. They will be briefed on the approach for DOE SNF and we will recalibrate as needed during the December-January timeframe.

- NRC has requested updates on DOE SNF via Phil Wheatley.

WASRD

Markus Popa

Markus Popa reported that a Confirmatory Review of WASRD Revision 5 has been completed. Comments have been incorporated and there will be one final review issued to obtain agreement from the sites. Remember, Revision 5 is a baseline view of a point in time.

Q: How does the Repository look at alternative waste forms?

A: Do not jeopardize the 2004 schedule. Form a group to look at other EM Waste Forms.

- Legal. Can it go to the Repository under the NWPA? General Council rule.
- Engineering and Analysis determinations.

Q: Is this a problem of funding or resources?

A: The analysis and modeling are people constrained. Need to better understand expertise at the Repository to resolve.

- It affects HLW and Calcine the most, as well as lesser glass.
- We can't give them a guarantee that lesser glass will be okay. Analysis is resource constrained for TSPA.

Q: HLW and other alternative waste forms will take significant amount of time.

When do we start doing tests? More data is needed.

A: NRC has to agree.

Q: Can we do a rough order of magnitude estimate for a two-week test for technology needed for HLW? Hanford needs this information.

A: Depends upon acceptance from Margaret Chu and Bob Card.

Q: Can you go forward with the same post-closure strategy for HLW as was used for SNF? If it is the same post-closure analysis as SNF, we should not need closure tests.

A: Some analysis would still need to be done and discussions with the NRC would be needed. SNF philosophy emphasized that systems, structures, and components (SSCs) were most important..

- Need to show that it is solid, not pyrophoric, and it can't compromise the nickel alloy package.
- There are some RCRA concerns.
- The NRC needs to be convinced.
- Be careful not to raise concerns over NEPA.
- Idea: Do a first level sensitivity analysis on the HLW by accelerating degradation analysis.

MOA Transition Team Development

Larry Vaughn

- Larry Vaughn from DOE Headquarters discussed the intended transition of EM Memorandums of Agreements (MOAs) into other applicable documents.
 - EM has made commitments that they no longer want to recognize.
 - EM wants more formalization in their agreements than provided by MOAs.
 - Many of these MOAs and other documents should be transitioned to RW.
 - EM will work with RW to consolidate requirements from MOAs into RW's documents.
- Larry Vaughn was directed to form a team to look at the MOAs and other applicable documents and identify opportunities for integration and consolidation into RW documents. (E.g., we need one place to find waste acceptance documents.)
 - Produce a set of integrated documents that include the roles and responsibilities along with a signature of the affected parties.
 - Appendices could contain the separate documents.
 - Need to bring formality to the documents and outline responsibilities.

Q: What is the status of the rumor in the complex that the Quality Assessment Requirements Document (QARD) will be eliminated in favor of NQA-1? Commercial fuel will be arriving at the Repository under NQA-1. Why would other receipts be accepted under more stringent standards than NQA-1?

A: Unsure of validity of rumor.

- Concern: MOAs are written for very specific purposes. It will be difficult to combine them with other documents. How do we ensure the pieces don't get split up? A comprehensive MOA would have to be reviewed by legal experts. (See Action #2).

Q: Does the NSNFP QA still fund the QA qualifications for DOE SNF? There was a clarification letter issued, but it was not clear. It appears that RW will have to qualify all the DOE programs. (See Action #3).

A: Larry Vaughn does not agree. For HLW, DOE does not need to maintain a 0333P program. The right people have to be trained on how to do oversight. RW will have to determine their oversight program and quality requirements. SRS is not going to maintain a QA program.

EM SNF Corporate Project Team Status

Christine Gelles

Christine Gelles is the Project Manager for the EM Corporate Project Team on *Integrated/Risk-Driven Disposition of SNF*. She presented the background information on the development of the project and the objective/deliverable of the team.

- The overall purpose of the team is to educate Jesse Roberson on SNF management.
- The purpose as stated in the EM Corporate Project Charter for the “Integrated/Risk-Driven Spent Nuclear Fuel Disposition” Project is
 “This project will identify, plan, and recommend an integrated, corporate strategy for management of EM spent nuclear fuel (SNF) activities. The corporate strategy will be focused on reduction of environmental and programmatic risk, project acceleration, and identification of programmatic streamlining and cost efficiencies. The need for this project and the development of the integrated strategy was identified within the *EM Top-to-Bottom Review*.”
- Jesse Roberson and Bob Card achieved accelerated closure at Rocky Flats under budget and ahead of schedule. They resolved the contractual issues and used disciplined project management tools.
- The goal of this Corporate Project Team is to formalize integration and tools to address programmatic risk.
 - The team will develop the project management tools to ensure the process remains in place for the long-term.
 - We want the options that provide the greatest likelihood of success.
 - Leverage the studies that have been done.
- The deliverable is an Integrated Programmatic Risk Assessment Tool with identified resources and detailed risks.
- The CD-0 project package was approved.
 - CD-1 will be submitted by December 2002.
 - CD-2 is due in early summer of 2003.
 - CD-3 is the complete deliverable due by September 2003.

Q: What is the impact now that the INEEL is a NE site?

A: The transition is in the planning stages now, but this team will determine how to split fuel-funding decisions.

EM HLW Project Team Status & SNF Interfaces

Pete Dirkmaat

Pete Dirkmaat reviewed the status of the HLW Project Team, which is currently in the process of visiting the sites.

- One of the issues is the low activity faction and the determination between vitrification and grout.

- Status at the INEEL.
 - Looking at the reclassification of the Sodium Bearing Waste (SBW).
 - Considering direct shipment of the calcine to the Repository.
 - The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was issued and they are hoping the Record of Decision (ROD) will be issued by Christmas.
- West Valley is complete; the melter is cold.
 - Some analysis may be done on the melter to gather data on use and expected life.
 - It is not clear how much destructive analysis will be done.

Hanford SNF Strategies

Mark French

- At this time, 134 MCOs have been filled at Hanford.
 - We have to fill 3 MCOs a week to meet the schedule; however, the current throughput is 5 per week.

Q: Were you going to use a centrifuge to remove the sludge and pieces?

A: No, they will use some filtering with a vacuum system.

Q: Do you expect problems with the K-East Basin fuels?

A: No. Even though the fuel is not in good shape, the equipment is good.

- Hanford has 5 NAC-1 casks in the Interim Storage Area (ISA) and expect the 6th one to be delivered in the next month.
 - These casks have been purchased by Hanford.
 - They will hold a rod consolidation assembly.
- The T-Plant will be used for sludge storage after the SNF is removed.
- Issues:
 - Funding necessary to support accelerated closure.
 - Non self-protecting irradiated fuel storage (security deviation or alternate storage site).
 - T-3 Cask License for sodium bonded FFTF fuel shipments to INEEL, has expired.
 - Office of River Protection interfaces for CSB operations and transfers to repository.
 - Transport of the MCOs to Yucca Mountain.

SRS SNF Strategies

Randy Ponik

- Path forward:
 - K-Basin is one deactivation process with a short duration.
 - RBOF involves deactivation of the entire facility.

Q: How can you meet acceptance criteria at the Repository if you ship them bare fuel (no canister)?

A: Don't know.

- Issues:
 - If the Repository cannot start receiving SNF as scheduled, SRS will be impacted due to lack of storage. This is also impacted by SNF receipts from DRR and FRR.

INEEL SNF Strategies

Pete Dirkmaat

- 42 shipments of SNF were removed from the Materials Test Reactor (MTR) prior to the end of September. It was hot vacuum dried and stored in the Irradiated Fuel Storage Facility (IFSF).
- The remaining commercial SNF and Loft SNF stored at Test Area North (TAN) were dried in a cold vacuum and placed in existing casks on a storage pad. All SNF has been removed from the TAN pool.
- In FY-03, 2500 small fuel elements will be removed from the Power Burst Facility (PBF). It will be drip dried and transported to the IFSF. Once complete, all satellite pool storage at the INEEL will be closed.
- Nuclear Energy (NE) was named the new PSO at the INEEL. This may impact some facilities that are on the 2012 Accelerated Closure Plan.
- Accelerated Closure Plans are being finalized and are intended to reduce life cycle costs.
 - Fermi Blanket Fuel Treatment may be transferred to NE.
 - Negotiations with Navy to transfer their SNF back to them.
- NRC questions on the standard canister are being addressed through the NSNFP. Hopefully, this will encompass all SNF sites so they don't have to answer the same NRC questions.

- Issues:
 - Foster Wheeler Dry Storage Facility is under review to determine whether to continue, cancel, or modify the contract.

ANL-W – MEDC/EMT

Bob Pahl

- ANL is ramping up to treat 25,000 MTHM SNF and 34 MTHM of Fermi Blanket Fuel.

Q: How much waste is created with the treatment process?

A: We will fill about 34 waste packages with process waste.

- There are two HLW forms from the Electro Metallurgy Process (EMT).
 - Ceramic – has a zeolite mixture with active fission products bonded with glass.
 - Noble metal fission product – is stainless steel based with some zirconium.

Q: What was the rationale for putting in the Advanced Fuel Recycling Initiative?

A: One of our new focuses is recycling technology.

Q: Do you have concurrence from RW on how much vitrified HLW should go into a canister?

A: Codisposal of the waste product will be with the standard canister.

Q: Do you have customers for your uranium?

A: Has been declared Orphan material and will be blended down to 20% enrichment.

- Melt, Drain, Evaporate Carbonate (MEDEC) process.
 - Processes non-RCRA SNF into depleted uranium slugs.
 - There is a significant amount of plutonium in the Fermi Blanket fuel.
 - DOE funded a two-year study, which should be finished by 12/03.

- There is not much off-gas going up the stack with the EMT process.

Q: Are you thinking in terms of costs?

A: There is a SAIC report that identifies \$40 million needed to operate in HFEF for 4 years. This does not include startup and shut down. ANL does not have their cost estimate completed.

- Issues:
 - Coordination with the INEEL to ship SNF to the Repository.
 - EBR-II fuel disposal in the Repository has high-grade uranium even with MEDEC treatment. This issue can be overcome with time and funding to analyze.

Quality Assurance Director

Denny Brown

Bob Blyth introduced the new QA Director for RW, Denny Brown. Mr. Brown said he would be looking for opportunities to simplify QA, even though the requirements won't change. He is interested in lessons learned from the sites that can be incorporated at BSC. He expects to discuss how to do NSNFP QA oversight with Margaret Shue within the next two weeks. Finally, he does not expect the QARD to be eliminated.

Quality Assurance

Robert Blyth

Bob Blyth discussed the latest improvement to the QA program – the ability to change a procedure in 2-3 hours.

Q: Will there be continued site audits?

A: Yes, until we receive written direction to change.

Q: What is the status on non-licensed INEEL SNF?

A: Anything not under TMI or 0333P only applies to the repository. Our License Application for TMI and FSV use the 0333P Program with NRC integration.

Canister and Weld Development Update

Tom Hill

Tom Hill discussed the N-stamp issue with the standard canister. NRC encourages the use of industry standards. The MCOs at Hanford have an N-stamp. Foster Wheeler was planning to N-Stamp their canisters. The benefit is the pedigree and traceability provided by the N-Stamp. A cost/benefit analysis will be done to determine value of the N-Stamp.

Q: What is the investment required to get the N-Stamp.

A: You pay for the upfront program and then stamp each vessel at the point of fabrication.

Q: Does RW agree?

A: No, unless there is a requirement. There is no value. Final welds are inspected after the fuel is loaded.

Q: What is the status of the drying standard?

A: The draft should be out for the next meeting in January. It is about 95% complete.

Safeguards & Security Update

Bill Hurt

Bill Hurt provided an overview of the Safeguards and Security (S&S) activities to date.

- RW has four parameters to determine attractiveness.
 - Separability
 - Homogeneity
 - Fissile Content
 - Weight
- A workshop was held last January to look at attractiveness of DOE fuel in a standard canister. The results of this workshop have not been issued yet.
- One of the issues for the Corporate SNF Project Team (Christine Gelles) is to consider S&S.
 - The requirements are not clear for DOE fuels that are lightly irradiated.
 - The weight of a standard canister is a deterrent.
 - The fissile content is highly variable.
 - If the standard canister is not used for disposal, then S&S will have to take a different approach.

DOE Breakout Session

Andy Griffith

Andy Griffith reported the two main issues discussed in the DOE Breakout Session.

1. There is a set of 13 new performance measures attached to a memo from EM last week. Each site is to develop quarterly targets for FY-03, which include interpretation, implementation, and alternatives.
 - The bare fuel alternative is being evaluated as well as how the standard applies. The standard canister would meet the terms of the measure.
 - The only site meeting the measure now is Hanford with their MCO.
 - The measures are life cycle.
 - Could evaluate in assemblies or SNF units.
 - There is not much room to determine alternatives.

- Andy Griffith and Christine Gelles will pursue the limitations of this measure with EM-20.
2. Issues with the transition of the NSNFP from EM to RW.
- How to divide the functions.
 - Who is responsible for the Settlement Agreements direction to provide a Center for Spent Fuel Disposal?
 - How will the DOE SNF in the repository application be represented consistently?
 - There will still be a need for EM to have an interface with RW. This should be considered as part of EM restructuring.
 - Some of the tools developed by Christine Gelles' Corporate Project Team should be retained with EM to facilitate interaction with RW (e.g., Integrated Schedule and PM tools).
 - EM needs a central POC that includes some analysis function.
 - EM would have to retain the NSNFP database.
 - Who will own the corporate tools developed by the Corporate Project Team?

Contractor Breakout Session

Phil Wheatley

Phil Wheatley outlined the issues discussed in the Contractor Breakout Session.

- Issue 1: The Standard Canister/Package is the basis for our planning. (The contractors determined this to be the most important issue.)
- What are the impacts if the Standard Canister is not used?
 - More fuel analysis and measurements at the sites.
 - DOE SNF may not be compliant with the Repository License.
 - Major impacts to the receiving facility and process at the Repository.
 - More tool designs to handle various fuels and miscellaneous canisters.
 - Different processes to handle fuel types.
 - Facility design.
 - Potential to contaminate hot cells.
 - Push out the fuel receipt schedule.
 - What can be done?
 - NSNFP has been meeting with RW to discuss issues with handling, packaging, and transportation (e.g., Nancy William's visit to the INEEL).
 - Education of the programs and organizations involved.
 - Christine Gelles requested meetings and discussions of fuels and site conditions.

Issue 2: The function of the NSNFP is to represent the sites with repository issues.

- This function is critical for continued site support, coordination, and interface with the Repository.
- We need a total DOE life cycle cost study.
- If we work for RW, it changes our working relationship with EM. (Under RW work scope direction.)
- The NSNFP previously funded various analyses used by all sites in support of the Repository. Who will provide this funding in the future?
- Who and how will the NSNSP (or equivalent) program be funded?
- The balanced or negotiated approach with RW may be lost if NSNFP is terminated. If there are changes in RW requirements, it could cost the sites a lot of money (e.g. WIPP lessons learned).
- We can't lose this close coupling.
- What role will the sites serve without the NSNFP? Will each site have to show compliance to RW?

Issue 3: The transition away from MOAs may be premature.

- It may be too early to eliminate MOAs and incorporate them into other documents.
 - Timing issues with other documents associated with pending actions or commitments.
 - Requirements.
 - Contractual issues.
- We should wait for the Corporate Project Team's results before changing or eliminating MOAs.
- How doe RW communicate with each site without MOAs? How does RW obtain authority to do audits? What governs contractual relationships.

Issue 4: Impacts to the DOE SNF sites from redirection in SRS work scope.

- Direct disposal of FRR and DRR at the Repository.
- Other sites are planning for direct disposal of SNF. Need to maintain integrated planning efforts.
- Melt and Dilute.
- Some of the other impacted sites have not been involved in these discussions.

Source Term Development

Henry Loo

Henry Loo provided a status of the Source Term Development Team.

- The 3rd report contains 15 available templates based on timeframes. These were paired down from the 2nd report from June 2000.

- When the information was insufficient to determine a matched template, the worst quantities were selected to produce a conservative assumption. This increased uncertainty. Applies to 2.3% of DOE SNF only. This accounts for 95% of the total calculated radionuclide inventory. (See Action Item #4.)
- The issue is being over conservative does not give us a clear idea of true reality.
- For the TSPA, RW could use the mean or median condition and not the bounding condition.
- The team is looking at adding one more template for LWBR SNF to reduce the 2.3% high impact fuels.

Q: Who is the customer?

A: RW and INEEL. They use the consistent source terms for defensible analysis.

Q: Can the sites use the templates to cover their fuel?

A: RW wants a defensible basis, but this is not the only way. This approach takes the burden off the sites, but transport analysis is still needed.

Transportation Planning Update

Tom Hill

Tom Hill provided a status on the site's transportation planning activities.

- The Transportation team is about finished with their input.
 - Hanford has completed and transmitted their input.
 - SRS is ready to submit.
 - INEEL has a draft in review and will send it to DOE next week.
- The input from the sites will be put into one document for consolidation in the RFP. This final document will be sent to the sites for one more review.
- The INEEL assumes the use of a standard canister.
- The schedule for the RFP is on the home page.
- HLW has submitted their RFP already.

Integrated Receipt Schedule

Mark Arenaz

Mark Arenaz discussed the Integrated Receipt Schedule. The sites need to be sure of their plans. We expect there will be issues with shipping and receiving quantities at the sites and RW. Throughput is another issue. As soon as the sites are ready, we will reconvene the team and move forward.

- Comment: RW has 1000 MTHM lag storage. They do not expect to be able to support the Integrated Receipt Schedule as written.

Closing Remarks

Andy Griffith/Mark Arenaz

Stay focused and don't lose hope.

Be responsive and proactive to the requests from Christine Gelles and her team. Call the team members if you have input.